

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/010,711	11/08/2001	David Jay Smith	1313/1H649-US1	2757
7590 10/17/2003			EXAMINER	
DARBY & DARBY P.C.			ELHILO, EISA B	
805 Third Aven New York, NY		•	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			1751	10
·			DATE MAILED: 10/17/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u>``</u>		- Ga	A <sup>S</sup>
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/010,711	' SMITH ET AL.	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eisa B Elhilo	1751	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover shee	et with the correspondence addre	ss
THE REPLY FILED 19 September 2003 FAILS TO PL Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of App Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of (1) a timely filed amer	f this application. A proper reply adment which places the application	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR R	REPLY (check either a)	or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	*		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Acevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f).	than SIX MONTHS from the S FILED WITHIN TWO MOR	mailing date of the final rejection. NTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. Ser	e MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The chave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension of the shorten (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three nearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding ed statutory period for reply o	amount of the fee. The appropriate exter riginally set in the final Office action; or (2)	nsion fee under r) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellan 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 C			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furt	her consideration and/	or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	e below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for app	eal by materially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) M they present additional claims without cancel	eling a corresponding	number of finally rejected claims	S.
NOTE: Claim 139 as a new claim is presented	after final rejection .		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ection(s):		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	ld be allowable if subm	nitted in a separate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request to application in condition for allowance because: §		been considered but does NOT	「place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered by raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directe	d SOLELY to issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims to			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	s:		
Claim(s) allowed: None.			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>None</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>8,33-37 and 53-79</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-7,9-32,	.38-52 and 80-138.		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on		) disapproved by the Exami	ner.
9.⊠ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem			
10. Other:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
• ,			



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has not presented any additional data or showing to overcome the rejection of record. The arguments presented in paper No. 9, dated 9/19/2003 merely rehash the arguments presented earlier which were fully responded by the examiner in previous office action in paper No. 8, dated 6,24,2003.

(). YOGENDRA N. GUPTA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700